

SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT, P.A.
1625 RADIO DRIVE, SUITE 300
WOODBURY, MINNESOTA 55125
TEL 651.735-1100
FAX 651.735-1102
WWW.SSIPLAW.COM

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
AUG 09 2007

FACSIMILE SUBMISSION UNDER 37 CFR 1.8

TO:	Examiner -Quang N. Nguyen	FROM:	Steven J. Shumaker
COMPANY:	USPTO	DATE:	AUGUST 9, 2007
FAX NUMBER:	1-571-273-8300	TOTAL NO. OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER:	3
PHONE NUMBER:		SENDER'S REFERENCE NUMBER:	1034-004US01
RE:	Interview Summary	APPLICATION SERIAL NUMBER:	10/691,166

AUG 09 2007**PATENT****IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant:	Christopher D. Koch; Duane M. Butler; Steven G. Knight; Bruce F. Naegele	Confirmation No.	6530
Serial No.:	10/691,166		
Filed:	October 22, 2003	Customer No.:	28863
Examiner:	Quang N. Nguyen		
Group Art Unit:	2141		
Docket No.:	1034-004US01		
Title:	PASSIVE OPTICAL NETWORK ADDRESS ASSOCIATION RECOVERY		

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Commissioner for Patents
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In a personal interview initiated by Applicant on July 10, 2007, Examiner Nguyen, Applicant's representative (Steven J. Shumaker, Reg. No. 36,275) and inventor, Christopher D. Koch discussed the above-referenced application.

In the interview, the parties discussed the limitations set forth in the claims, and the rejections under sections 101 and 103. Applicant emphasized differences between the claimed invention and the Blahut and Banerjee references. In particular, Applicant noted that such references do not suggest detecting a disablement of a passive optical network, storing address association information indicating association of network addresses with the network clients upon detecting the disablement, and associating the network addresses and the network clients based on the stored address association information upon recovery from the disablement.

The Examiner suggested further clarification of the claim language to more clearly define such differences for purposes of section 103, and to emphasize a practical application of the claimed invention for purposes of section 101. Applicant's representative did not agree that clarifying amendments are needed. Applicant's representative noted that the claims clearly recite a practical application, as the various claims are directed to methods, devices and

computer-readable storage media relating to reestablishing association of network address information with network clients in a passive optical network (PON) upon recovery of the network from disablement. However, Applicant's representative agreed to consider amendments in the response to the Office Action dated April 2, 2007. The Examiner indicated that upon receiving the response, he would reconsider the rejections. No agreement was reached as to patentability of the claims.

Applicants filed a response to the Office Action on August 2, 2007. This Interview Summary was not submitted with the response through inadvertence. However, this Interview Summary is being filed within one month of the interview date of July 10, 2007.

Date:

8-9-07

SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT, P.A.
1625 Radio Drive, Suite 300
Woodbury, Minnesota 55125
Telephone: 651.735.1100
Facsimile: 651.735.1102

By:



Name: Steven J. Shumaker
Reg. No.: 36,275